

## II. REMARKS

1. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 are not anticipated by Cordery et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,175,827 ("Cordery") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Cordery fails to disclose each element of Applicant's invention as is required to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). It is well settled that a claim is anticipated "only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (See CHISOLM, Federal Circuit Guide, Pg. 1221). A reference only anticipates a claim if the reference discloses every element of the claims. Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991); 18 USPQ2d 1001. The lack of or absence from the reference of any one of the claimed features of the invention will negate anticipation. Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible Inc., 793 F.2d 1565, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1986); 230 USPQ 81.

Cordery fails to disclose or suggest "first and second bar-code readers", "a first paper path", "a second paper path", "a third paper path", "a fourth paper path" or a "fifth paper path" as recited by Applicant in claim 1.

Claim 1 recites that the system defines a "first paper path" through the first bar-code reader and through a first collator. The system will collate a mail piece in a "second paper path" in the event of a successful reading of the bar-coded indicium by the "first bar-code reader". The system will collate mail pieces in a "third paper path" in the event of an unsuccessful

reading of the bar-coded indicium by the first bar-code reader. The "third paper path" leads to a "second bar-code reader". If the reading of the indicium by the "second bar-code" reader is successful, the mail pieces go to a "fourth paper path", and if unsuccessful, the mail pieces go to a "fifth paper path." None of these features are disclosed or suggested by Cordery.

Cordery does not disclose or suggest collating a mail piece in a second paper path in the event of a successful reading and collating a mail piece in a third paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading, the "third paper path leading to said second bar-code reader", as recited by Applicant in claim 1.

Cordery relates to verifying authentication and integrity information printed on a mail piece by obtaining an "error correction code" printed on the document and employing the obtained error correction code to verify the validity of the evidencing information (Abstract, lines 4-8). Cordery involves printing "auxillary information" in an appropriate location on a mailpiece (Col. 4, lines 53-57). An "error correction code" is incorporated into the digital token to provide enhanced functionality for mail processing (Col. 4, line 66 to Col. 5, line 4). The "error correction code" can be read from the mailpiece and the digital token may be verifiable even if the addressee information is not or is only partially readable (Col. 5, lines 8-11). Cordery includes generating an error correction code for information on a document and generating a digital token employing the error correction code (Col. 5, lines 61-64). Cordery also involves obtaining an error correction code printed on a document and employing the obtained error correction code to verify the validity of evidencing information (Col. 6, lines 1-5). Cordery also includes obtaining an error correction code

printed on a mail piece and determining that the obtained error correction code is inaccurate (Col. 6, lines 8-10). None of the foregoing discloses or suggests Applicant's invention.

Although Cordery discloses sorting a mail stream by a sorter 118 "which reads addresses associated with the mailpiece with the assistance of the error correction code" and a "verification processing system" 120 to sample the mail stream (Col. 12, lines 35-42), Cordery is devoid of any disclosure related to first and second bar-code readers, a "second paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said first bar code reader," a "fourth paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader" or a "fifth paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader" as recited by Applicant in claim 1.

Since Cordery does not disclose or suggest any of the foregoing features recited in Applicant's claim 1, let alone even one, Cordery clearly cannot anticipate, and does not in any way obviate Applicant's invention. Thus, claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 2 further recites a "third bar code reader", a "fifth paper path through a second collator", a "sixth paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-coded reader" and a "seventh paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader." Not a single one of these claimed features is even remotely suggested by Cordery. Thus, the claim cannot be anticipated.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and should be allowable at least in view of the dependencies.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 3, there is no disclosure in Cordery of more than one bar code reader, or that a first bar code reader is less expensive than a second bar code reader. Column 5, lines 28-35 referred to by the Examiner merely talks about the ability to process larger portions of mail verifying the digital token and detecting attempts to defraud the mail processing system.

With regard to claim 4, Column 6, lines 6-15 of Cordery referred to by the Examiner is absolutely silent about more than one bar code reader, let alone that a first bar code reader is faster than a second.

With regard to claim 5, Column 5, lines 5-12 cited by the Examiner makes absolutely no mention of more than one bar code reader and is positively silent regarding a "scanning resolution" of a bar code reader.

Although the Examiner makes a note that the particular columns and line numbers are for the convenience of the applicant, it is respectfully submitted that the citations fail to disclose or suggest a single claimed feature of Applicant's invention. Applicant has considered and studied the document as a whole very carefully, and even in its entirety, it fails to disclose or suggest the features of Applicant's invention as recited in the claims.

2. Claims 6-19 are not anticipated by Cordery under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claim 6 recites automatically collating the mail piece to a second paper path to a second bar code reader in the event of an unsuccessful reading of the indicium by the first bar code reader. As noted above, Cordery does not disclose or suggest collating a mail piece to a second paper path to a second bar

code reader in the event of an unsuccessful reading of an indicium by the first bar code reader. Cordery does not disclose or suggest collating a mail piece to a second paper path to a second bar code reader in an event of an unsuccessful reading of the indicium by the first bar code reader. Thus, claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by Cordery.


Claims 7-19 depend from claim 6, and these claims should also be allowable in view of at least the dependencies.

3. Claims 20-23 are not anticipated by Cordery under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claim 20 recites first, second and third bar code readers and that the system is disposed to collate mail pieces in a third paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of the reader of the bar coded indicium by the first bar code reader. The third paper path leads to the third bar code reader. As noted previously, Cordery does not disclose first and second bar code readers, or that the system collates a mail piece bearing an unsuccessfully read bar coded indicium to a paper path that leads to another bar code reader. Therefore, claim 20 is not disclosed or suggested by Cordery under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 21-23 depend from claim 20, and should be allowable at least in view of the dependencies.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-23 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Each element of applicant's invention as claimed is not disclosed or suggested by Cordery.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.  
Reg. No. 44,004

18 December 2003  
Date

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 12/18/03

Signature:   
Person Making Deposit